ED 072 369 **HUMAN RELATIONS PERSPECTIVES ON MOTIVATION: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL.**
H. ROY KAPLAN, ET AL. AUG 72. 24P.

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 369 CG 007 726

AUTHOR Kaplan, H. Roy; And Others
TITLE Human Relations Perspectives on Motivation: A Critical Appraisal.
PUB DATE Aug 72
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meeting (67th, August 28-31, 1972, New Orleans, Louisiana)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; *Cultural Factors; Decision Making; Employee Attitudes; *Human Relations; Literature Reviews; Management; Models; *Motivation; Participation; Personality; *Personnel Management; *Personnel Policy; Self Actualization; Social Class; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

While the appellation of Human Relationist has fallen into disuse today vestiges of this tradition persist in many approaches to "humanize" organizations. In this paper, Human Relations assumptions about the motivation of workers and their desire for participation are analyzed and assessed in relation to empirical studies. A typology of models of participation is also developed to compare and evaluate workable methods of participation in organizations with the more idealistic alternatives offered by advocates of humanistic management and industrial humanism. The data indicate that Human Relationists may be overstating the utility and benefits derived from increased worker participation in organizational decision making; and their belief in the necessity for workers to self-actualize in their jobs is predicated upon assumptions which seem to ignore the influence that social class has on the motivations of workers. (Author)

ED 072369

Human Relations Perspectives on Motivation: A Critical Appraisal

H. Roy Kaplan
SUNY at Buffalo

Curt Tausky
University of Massachusetts

Bhopinder S. Bolaria
University of Saskatchewan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 007 726

Paper presented at the Sixty-Seventh meeting of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, August, 1972.

Human Relations Perspectives on Motivation:

A Critical Appraisal

Human relations theorists are by no means all products of the same mold, nor do they go by the same "handle."[1] Yet there is a core of principles which they appear to share. These principles rest on assumptions which deserve close scrutiny.

Let us begin with the concept of job enlargement since it provides insight into human relations thinking. Job enlargement combines the small tasks of several men in a longer work cycle. As Rensis Likert has put it, every worker "...should see his role as difficult, important and meaningful.... When jobs do not meet this specification they should be reorganized so that they do."[2]

Many human relationists stretch this concept beyond its technical meaning by saying that not only are more challenging tasks desirable, but so is participation in the decisions which affect the work process. It can then be seen that human relations theory is, in part, a reaction against Frederick Taylor's scientific management.[3]

Although human relationists react against the substantive reasoning of scientific management, they share a common outlook on two basic issues. First, both perspectives hold out the tantalizing promise of increased work effort among organizational participants. They differ on how to accomplish this, but agree there is a "one best way." Job enlargement and participation are among the means proposed by human relationists to heighten commitment toward work. But one feature of these means should be noticed--the assumption of a relationship between non-financial satisfactions and the degree of effort expended on work tasks. There is a growing body of evidence which suggests that -

satisfactions and work effort are unrelated or slightly related, and sometimes even negatively related. For example, Tannenbaum found that among 33 automobile dealerships and 32 delivery agencies, autonomy is related to employee satisfaction--with correlations ranging from .03 to .55--but job satisfaction and productivity show correlations ranging from .14 to -.18. One may conclude that an increase in work satisfaction cannot always be expected to yield increments in work effort.[4]

A second revealing similarity between scientific management and human relations is the assumption that individual interests and organizational roles are compatible. If conflict exists it is due to an improper form of organization which can be remedied. In the scientific management framework, monetary incentives were thought to solve the problem; in the human relations framework, training in interpersonal relations and participatory problem resolution are held to be means of resolving conflict. To assume that there is a remedy capable of making men <u>desire</u> to do that which is in the interests of the organization, perhaps places too much reliance on social-psychological techniques that are of questionable utility, and suggests a faith in man's inclinations to renounce individual advantage in favor of organizational goals. It is conceivable that collective bargaining is neglected by human relationists because they are reluctant to depart from the assumption that the "proper" organizational form can dissolve the incompatibility between individual and organizational goals.

The remainder of this paper is devoted to an analysis of assumptions that human relationists make about worker participation and motivation.

Models of Participation in Organization

The research of Kurt Lewin in the 1940's among boys' clubs and Red Cross volunteer nurses was instrumental in supporting the hypothesis that participation in decision making heightens cooperation with group goals.[5] The research is essentially a critique of unilateral power. The compatibility of participation with democratic values is obvious. Underlying both is the assumption that consensus yields commitment to the shared decision; hence social control is more effective since it then rests, in part, on the self-control of the participants. Moreover, in human relations theory a link between participation and productivity is postulated. This chain of reasoning is along the lines: participation increases satisfaction and satisfaction is reflected in increased work effort. It must be reiterated that this is a highly tenuous assumption.

To go further than these general comments it is necessary to develop more specific models of participation in organizations. Figure 1 depicts a typology of five models of worker participation in decision making based on the kinds of interaction found among superiors and subordinates. They flow in a continuum from the most structured Bureaucratic type, to the least structured or Delegative type.

Figure 1 Types of Decision Making

Most Hierarchical				Least Hierarchical
Bureaucratic	Representative Bureaucratic	Consultative Bureaucratic	Collegial	Delegative

In the Bureaucratic Relationship there is a definitive hierarchical pattern between leaders and followers. The leader provides detailed

direction and evaluates results. Knowledge possessed by the subordinate is superfluous in this relationship outside of its direct application to his job performance.

The Representative Bureaucratic Relationship is similar to its purer form above, but with the important difference that more than one center of power exists and these centers negotiate rules and rewards. Collective bargaining illustrates this arrangement. However, the principles embodied in the contract are binding on all parties and have the character of bureaucratic rules over the life of a contract once it is settled. Participation in decision making is not direct but through agents who represent the parties to the contract.

Especially at the administrative level of organization, the Consultative Bureaucratic Relationship is more realistic than the pure bureaucratic type from which it differs in that superiors openly ask for advice or opinion from subordinates. "Talk" about the matter at hand is customary. This type also encompasses committee participation in decisions, when such participation is advisory only. One reason why this model appears to more accurately reflect administrative relationships in American work organizations than in France, Germany, and to a lesser extent Britain, is because we place less emphasis on status differences and overt deference. This is due in part to our democratic ethos and the related leveling effect of mass education. Research suggests that successful organizations in a rapidly changing environment are characterized by "organic" rather than "mechanistic" administrative forms. A rigid set of duties and unilateral command cannot cope well with change, whereas the organic systems, with more

loosely defined tasks and a richer web of information exchange, are more responsive to environmental change. At the interface of first-line supervision and manual work, the evidence is rather persuasive that a pure bureaucratic relationship is effective in mass production systems, but a form similar to consultative bureaucracy is more effective in job-shop operations on the one hand, and automated processes on the other.

The essense of the Collegial Relationship model is equalitarian interaction. Decision making is viewed as a process in which competence counts more than organizational rank. In the case of committees or task forces the collegial relationship may include voting. At the individual level, organizational rank is viewed as an administrative mechanism to reward length of service and prior contributions. Disagreements are not solved by a superior's fiat. Rungs on the ladder of rank tend to be small in number, as in research and educational organizations. Collegial types of relationships predominate among professionals, such as the departments of a university or the R & D units of industrial firms.

The extensive autonomy suggested by the Delegative Relationship model is unrealistic, except for isolated cases, since the conception involves autonomy of ends and means in the work setting. A senior research chemist is illustrative. Both the ends to which the research may lead, as well as the means, may be at the discretion of the researcher. There are of course such instances, but the more common situation might better be described as controlled freedom. Thus, a person with extensive autonomy must periodically justify his work or

forfeit the resources to continue. Empirically, delegation often evolves into a collegial relationship, i.e., the ends are more or less a given, but the means may be determined through interaction with colleagues.

It is evident from these models that human relations theory stresses consultative, collegial, and delegative relationships, and particularly favors the collegial type. There are, however, constraints on collegiality, the most important being the requirement that technical or professional training is recognized by colleagues as providing a foundation, a realistic basis for taking seriously one another's judgments. Among professionals this sort of foundation may exist, but it is questionable when extended to occupational groups wherein on-the-job experience, reflected in rank, is at least as important as formal training. Where this is the case, consultative relationships are a more realistic and viable alternative. Many foreman-worker interactions in a job-shop setting are, we suspect, examples of this sort of consultative form.

It might be noted that the collegial model has been suggested for universities as a pattern of governance as well as in the classroom. Thus, unicameral senates, composed of students, faculty, and administration, would be created. A serious flaw in this conception is that the basis for equality does not exist. If it did, students would not be students; they would have the knowledge they are presumably gaining. We might find that universities attempting to move from consultative to collegial arrangements will arrive at a three-sided representative bureaucracy of students, faculty, and administration, representing conflicting interests which become exacerbated in

the course of attempting to operate within the framework of collegiality.

Hugh Clegg in A New Approach to Industrial Democracy examined the outcome of worker participation in the form of codetermination and workers' management. His findings are most interesting. First, participation through representation did not in itself enhance workers' satisfaction. Neither collegiality through representation, nor delegation of decision making to workers' representatives, was reflected in satisfaction. Second, productivity was not related to participation through representation.[6] Nevertheless, it does appear to be true that at the person-to-person level, having a voice in the work process increases satisfaction, and here human relations has an important point. However, one should not be misled by this. Let us try to indicate briefly what can be said with some degree of confidence about participation.

(1) Most workers, white and blue collar, do not seek a collegial relationship with their supervisor. This emerged quite clearly in Tannenbaum's Control in Organizations. When samples of employees were asked about the existing distribution of control, and what it ideally should be, there was little divergence between the two distributions. The respondents did want more "say," but not much more than they had. Although a more consultative relationship was desired, it was well within the framework of expecting management to manage.

(2) Whatever increment in satisfaction may result from moving toward a consultative relationship, it is not reflected to a significant extent in greater work effort. Victor Vroom, and Brayfield and

Crockett, have surveyed the relationship between satisfaction and productivity and found it to be of negligible magnitude.[7] However, there is evidence to suggest that turnover and absenteeism are more closely related to satisfaction than direct work effort. Thus, the long run consequences of satisfaction cannot simply be dismissed.

(3) Even among professionals, as shown in Pelz and Andrews' study of scientists, the extensive autonomy represented by the delegation model was less effective in enhancing scientific productivity than a collegial relationship.[8] Apparently, the discussion of new directions of research and findings with other scientists and the laboratory director is salutary.

(4) Consultative and collegial participation may be more important to academic theorists than to people in bureaucratic settings. The material rewards an organization provides may, especially at the manual level, outweigh interests in participation in decision making. There is a considerable body of sociological literature which indicates a pronounced instrumental orientation toward work among manual workers, their major interest being wages and security.[9] One might speculate that the success programs such as the Scanlon and Kaiser plans enjoy is due more to their potential for increasing the size of the pay envelope than to the increased work effort which presumably follows from consultative relations. Here, we are led to a further discussion of the motivation of workers in contemporary society.

The Role of Ideology and Values in Human Relations Conceptions of Worker Motivation

Human relationists staunchly believe that workers identify with their work, and thus should have an opportunity for intrinsic involvement

in their jobs. This assumption is largely derived from the need theory of Abraham Maslow with its sine qua non of self-actualization through work.[10] From this arises an admonition to management to provide workers with stimulating work that is amenable to the satisfaction of higher level needs. The following statement from Frederick Herzberg illustrates this belief:

> Probably one of the most destructive misinterpretations of the American way of life has been to belittle, attenuate and degrade the concept of the worker's initiative and achievement as pursued for economic profit. Man does work for profit in order to avoid pain, but in a positive sense, he works to enjoy the excitement and meaning that achievement provides for his own psychological growth and thereby his happiness. The limitation of goals by those in industry to that of profit is contradicting and reducing our nation's great heritage. It suggests that there is no nobler purpose in the American experiment than the satisfaction of the avoidance needs of animals.[11]

The zeal that characterizes this statement is indicative of the subjective value-laden Weltanschauungen evinced by many contemporary human relationists. As Strauss has noted, "Human relations is normative, not purely descriptive. The authors involved, each in his own way, are crusaders."[12] Warren Bennis, one of the leading spokesmen of human relations, has stated that he and his followers are working "ambitiously to transform the basic value system of the enterprise so that humanistic and democratic values are infused and related to policy."[13] Maslow himself captured the Geist of the movement when he proclaimed "Salvation is a by-product of self-actualizing work and self-actualizing duty."[14] The thin veneer of such pronouncements barely veils the strong ideological orientation of human relationists.[15]

Hunan relationists maintain that contemporary complex organizations with their elaborate specialization of tasks, web of rules and

regulations, and assembly-line technology, are alienating large segments of workers from their work and work places.[16] The seeming preoccupation of workers with the satisfaction of lower level needs such as money and security is blamed on work organizations which, it is contended, have nurtured this behavior by rewarding employees with extrinsic or non-work-related incentives, e.g., salary and fringe benefits. To rectify this presumably abnormal situation, programs of job enrichment have been proposed to establish a "meaningful" motivation cycle. These programs are ostensibly designed to satisfy the higher level needs of workers by increasing their job involvement through decentralization of authority, rotation and enlargement of jobs, and the development of achievement, creativity, and independence among employees.[17]

Human relationists further contend that the dull and monotonous work prevalent in our society has led to a pervasive lack of commitment among the working population. However, data have been gathered which question the validity of this assumption. When various segments of the working population have been asked the question "If by some chance you had enough money to live comfortably without working, do you think that you would work anyway, or would you not work?" the answer has been preponderantly in the affirmative. Table 1 presents a comparison of responses to this question from five studies designed to ascertain the extent of commitment to work. It can be seen that there is a strong attachment to work not only among employed white and blue collar workers, but even among the chronically unemployed. This relationship also appears to be consistent through time as well as across social classes.

Table 1 about here.

Self-actualization: Inherited or Learned?

It is not our contention that all workers are deeply committed to their jobs, or that they view their work as intrinsically satisfying. However, these data indicate that many persons retain strong attachments to work as a socially desirable form of activity. The aversion to welfare among the respondents that is apparent from Table 1 lends further support to this assumption. Human relationists overstate the significance of such findings when they proclaim that people can only achieve inner peace through intrinsically satisfying work; and it is implicit in human relations ideology that blocked self-actualization in the job not only leads to conflict in the workplace, but adversely affects society as well. These are highly tenuous assumptions, for they ignore the socio-cultural component of self-actualization, i.e., its learned character, and ascribe its existence to an innate drive in man.[18] On the other hand, if we assume that the desire for self-actualization is learned, then there may only be a limited segment of the labor force which is, through long training and/or social class background, intrinsically dedicated to work, for example, scientists in basic research, R & D engineers, and some executives. Interestingly, Pelz and Andrews found that even scientists and engineers are interested in extrinsic rewards as well as the satisfactions they derive from involvement in their work.[19]

There is evidence which indicates that many workers derive their

satisfactions off their jobs as Dubin[20] and Chinoy[21] have shown. Studies indicate that it is possible for an individual to have a strong commitment to work for the economic function it performs without having an intrinsic interest in the task.[22] This condition of "detached involvement" with respect to work may be pervasive in our society, particularly among lower class persons whose background has not prepared them for jobs which afford, nor taught them to seek, self-actualization in work.[23]

The lack of intrinsic involvement in work among large portions of the population is taken as a sign of psychological pathology by many human relations adherents. We are told by Herzberg that the preoccupation of persons with "hygiene" factors, e.g., money, working conditions and security, is abnormal;[24] and Argyris charges that such persons have been made emotionally immature by the confining structures of contemporary organizations.[25] From the human relations perspective, the organization should help its employees to mature psychologically by providing them with "meaningful" work, for which service they would work enthusiastically to achieve organizational goals. How neat this package sounds! Unfortunately, life is not quite so simple, and neither are the motivations of employees.

Social Class: An Important Source of Work Motivation

When analyzing the motivations of workers, we must be cognizant of the variability of human needs and wants. Many studies have shown that people of lower class origins do not seek the same things from their jobs as middle and upper class persons.[26] The desire for achievement and independence in their work is often substantially less

than that exhibited by the latter groups.[27] On both levels, but particularly among blue collar workers, we find an interest in extrinsic job factors surrounding the work situation, such as salary, fringe benefits, job security, working conditions and, to some extent, supervision.[28] Table 2 presents data which indicate the importance of economic rewards derived from work to both white and blue collar workers, as is evidenced by their responses to items one and two. Interestingly, the middle-managers were the only group of individuals to ascribe other than economic importance to being promoted, perhaps indicating the middle class pressure for status and success.

Table 2 about here.

To understand the divergent work orientations of lower class persons we should look to the factors influencing them to seek extrinsic rewards from their work. The blame for their instrumental approach to work, i.e., as a means to an end, should not be placed solely on the structure of organizations (if, indeed, there is blame in the satisfaction of sustenance requirements). Our focus, and that of the human relationists, should more properly be turned to the opportunity structure of this society which has afforded only limited amounts of occupational mobility.[29] For many millions of persons who are forced to remain in states of relative deprivation and want, sometimes living in or close to hand-to-mouth conditions, there indeed is a tendency to seek the satisfaction of lower level needs to the exclusion of all others. This is a consequence of socialization in social strata wherein "challenging" work is unlikely, and not

anticipated. As for middle and upper level workers who evince a preoccupation with status, salary, and fringe benefits, this is easily explainable in the context of our consumption-oriented society which offers such rewards for achievement and performance. Are such people sick? Or, is it not normal for them to want what is viewed as desirable in their lives? Considering extreme groups, for the poor black in the ghetto a steady job with maintenance pay is valued, whereas for the white middle class executive a large desk in a private office, or a raise at the end of the year with guaranteed paid vacations is desirable. To argue that this runs counter to human nature is specious reasoning. At the moment, it is their human nature. Recent studies based upon more adequate assumptions of human motivation derived from the work of Atkinson,[30] Peak,[31] and Vroom[32] indicate that people consider the attractiveness of the consequences of the outcome of their motivation and seek to obtain those things which they believe they can realistically achieve.[33]

Largely based in academic surroundings which afford them opportunities for creativity and self-actualization, have human relationists inadvertently infused their own values into their theories and overgeneralized their perspectives to all workers? We might banally point out that many of them have frequently fallen happily into compliance with Academe's equivalent of the carrot and stick reward system which they are quick to condemn in industry, the "publish or perish" syndrome.

Some Concluding Comments

We do not want this paper to be construed as a personal attack on the many scholars who have been grouped under the rubric of human

relationists. We would be naive to assume that the assumptions which are questioned here are espoused in their totality by all of the diverse writers who advocate humanism in management and the decentralization of power in organizations. However, there is an unmistakable ideological air about much of their writing, which, we believe, has led to a distorted conception of workers' motivation and desire for control in organizations. Filled with exuberance to usher in a new society founded upon participative democracy, they consider the hierarchical structure of organizations repugnant. Clinging to a belief in the basic goodness of man and his innate desire to be creative and autonomous, they label "pathological" the preoccupation of large segments of the contemporary labor force with material rewards. Yet, the variability and choice they claim to be basic in man and essential ingredients in a "better" society is somehow ignored in the attempts to encapsulate all workers under a single motivational scheme.

What the data indicate to be the basis of motivation among workers differs considerably from the human relationists' ideological perspectives about this. To obtain an optimal level of effectiveness in the pursuit of organizational goals, with a minimum of conflict, management must first recognize the uniqueness of individuals within an organization and their differing orientations to work; all of which may be healthy when viewed within the context of an individual's cultural or subcultural affiliations. Generalizations aimed at neatly encapsulating the motivation of all workers regardless of occupational levels, classes, or job functions may prove to be spurious, and decisions predicated upon them could be conducive to heightening organizational conflict, rather than diminishing it.

Footnotes

[1]We are aware that the appellation of human relationist is seldom used by contemporary organizational theorists. Rather, they prefer to be called such things as industrial humanists, humanistic managers, industrial democrats, and enlightened managers. Nevertheless, there remains a strong and pervasive continuity of approach between the founders and the contemporary adherents of human relations. For an analysis of the areas of similarity and linkages between the two, see: George Strauss, "Human Relations--1968 Style," Industrial Relations, 7 (1968) pp. 262-276.

[2]Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), p. 103.

[3]Among Taylor's principles of work organization, the most important centered on: (1) the necessity to separate the functions of planning and execution, that is, thinking from doing; (2) the advantages of specialization which were to be gained by assigning men to small, routinized tasks; and (3) the requirement for material incentives, since he believed man was by nature lethargic unless a tangible reward is achievable.

For Taylor, the application of these normative principles was the key to increased organizational productivity, whereas to human relations theorists the solution to greater productivity lies in standing Taylor on his head, i.e., recombine small jobs and fuse thinking and doing as much as possible. By organizing the work in shop and office in this manner, runs their argument, material incentives become of secondary importance since the motivation to exert effort in behalf of organizational goals is then a consequence of the intrinsically interesting nature of the work role. Thus, by a pattern of work organization which reverses Taylor's principles (1) and (2), principle (3) is eliminated. For a review of Taylor's ideas see his Principles of Scientific Management, (New York: Harper, 1911).

[4]Arnold Tannenbaum, Control in Organizations, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1968) p. 83.

[5]Kurt Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change," in E. Maccoby, et al., eds., Readings in Social Psychology, (3rd ed.), New York: Holt, 1958, pp. 197-211; Ronald Lippit and Ralph K. White, "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in ibid., pp. 496-511.

[6]Hugh Clegg, A New Approach to Industrial Democracy, (Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, Ltd., 1963).

[7]Victor Vroom, Work and Motivation, (New York: Wiley, 1964), p. 183; Arthur H. Brayfield and James H. Crockett, "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance," Psychological Bulletin, 52 (1955), pp. 284-290.

[8]Donald Pelz, Frank Andrews, Scientists in Organizations, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966).

[9]Herbert H. Hyman, "A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," Class, Status, and Power, Reinhard Bendix, Seymour M. Lipset, (eds.), (second edition; New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 488-499; William H. Form, James A. Geschwender, "Social Reference Basis of Job Satisfaction: The Case of Manual Workers," American Sociological Review, 27 (April, 1962), pp. 228-237; LaMar T. Empey, "Social Class and Occupational Aspirations: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, 21 (December, 1956), pp. 703-709; E. H. Galler, "Influence of Social Class on Children's Choices of Occupations," Elementary School Journal, 51 (April, 1951), pp. 439-445; Richard Centers, Hadley Cantril, "Income Satisfaction and Income Aspiration," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 41 (1946), pp. 64-69; S. M. Miller, Frank Riessman, "The Working Class Subculture: A New View," Social Problems, 9 (Summer, 1961), pp. 86-97; Allison Davis, "The Motivation of the Underprivileged Worker," Industry and Society, William F. Whyte, (ed.), (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946), pp. 84-106; Robert Blauner, "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," Labor and Trade Unionism: An Inter-disciplinary Reader, Walter Galenson, Seymour M. Lipset, (eds.), (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960), pp. 539-560; Alex Inkeles, "Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception and Value," American Journal of Sociology, 66 (July, 1960), pp. 1-31; Ely Chinoy, "The Tradition of Opportunity and the Aspirations of Automobile Workers," American Journal of Sociology, 57 (March, 1952), pp. 453-459; Ruth Gould, "Some Sociological Determinants of Goal Strivings," Journal of Social Psychology, 13 (1941), pp. 461-473; R. A. Katzell, et al., "Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, and Situational Characteristics," Journal of Applied Psychology, 45 (April, 1961), pp. 65-72; Milton R. Blood, Charles L. Hulin, "Alienation, Environmental Characteristics, and Worker Responses," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51 (June, 1967), pp. 284-290; William F. Whyte, Money and Motivation: An Analysis of Incentives in Industry (New York: Harper, 1955); John H. Goldthorpe, et al., The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1968.)

[10]Abraham H. Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychological Review, 50 (July, 1943), pp. 381-382; Abraham H. Maslow, Eupsychian Management, (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. and the Dorsey Press, 1965), p. 6.

[11]Frederick Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man, (New York: World Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), p. 174.

[12]Strauss, op.cit., p. 265.

[13]Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 192.

[14]Maslow, Eupsychian Management, p. 6.

[15]For a further discussion of the ideological bent of human relationists see: Herbert G. Wilcox, "Hierarchy, Human Nature, and the Participative Panacea," Public Administration Review, 29 (Jan.-Feb., 1969), pp. 58-61.

[16]For example, see Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp. 66-75; Norman Maier, Principles of Human Relations, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1952), pp. 1-18; Douglas M. McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), pp. 45-57; Keith Davis, Human Relations at Work, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), pp. 20-34.

[17]Frederick Herzberg is a leading proponent of job enrichment. For an analysis of his perspective see his article "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review, 46 (January-February, 1968), pp. 53-62. See also M. Scott Myers, "Overcoming Union Opposition to Job Enrichment," Harvard Business Review, 49 (May-June, 1971), pp. 37-49.

[18]Maslow referred to the drive for self-actualization as being "instinctoid," i.e., biologically derived. Abraham H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), pp. 144-145. See Wilcox, op.cit. for a more detailed criticism of this pitfall in human relations theory.

[19]Pelz and Andrews, op.cit.

[20]Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," Social Problems, 3 (January, 1956), pp. 131-142.

[21]Ely Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1955).

[22]Eugene A. Friedmann, Robert J. Havighurst, (eds.), The Meaning of Work and Retirement, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954); Nancy C. Morse, Robert S. Weiss, "The Functions and Meaning of Work and the Job," American Sociological Review, 20 (April, 1955), pp. 191-198; Curt Tausky, "Meanings of Work Among Blue Collar Men," Pacific Sociological Review, 12 (Spring, 1969), pp. 49-55; H. Roy Kaplan, "The Meaning of Work Among the Hard-Core Unemployed," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1971.

[23]Furthermore, Seeman presents compelling evidence indicating that the ramifications of alienated labor for society may be negligent or minimal. His data indicate that work alienation and other forms of alienation are negatively or only slightly correlated. Melvin Seeman, "The Urban Alienations: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to Marcuse," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 19 (1971), pp. 135-143.

[24]Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man, pp. 168-192.

[25]Argyris, op.cit., pp. 76-122.

[26]The reader is referred to those sources which appear in footnote nine for confirming evidence of this point.

[27]Cf. David McClelland's work on achievement motivation in The Achieving Society, (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1961).

[28]Richard Centers, Daphne E. Bugental, "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Motivations Among Different Segments of the Working Population," Journal of Applied Psychology, 50 (June, 1966), pp. 193-197; Frank Friedlander, "Comparative Work Value Systems," Personnel Psychology, 18 (Spring, 1965), pp. 1-20; Roland J. Pellegrin, Charles H. Coates, "Executives and Supervision: Contrasting Definitions of Career Success," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1 (1956-1957), pp. 506-517; Nancy C. Morse, Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1953); Robert Bloom, John R. Barry, "Determinants of Work Attitudes Among Negroes," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51 (June, 1967), pp. 291-294; H. Roy Kaplan, Bhopinder S. Bolaria, "Job Satisfaction Among Scientific and Non-Scientific Personnel," Indian Sociological Bulletin, 6 (October, 1968) pp. 10-17; Frank Friedlander, "Importance of Work Versus Nonwork Among Socially and Occupationally Stratified Groups," Journal of Applied Psychology, 50 (December, 1966), pp. 437-441; Richard Centers, "Motivational Aspects of Occupational Stratification," Journal of Social Psychology, 28 (November, 1948), pp. 187-217; Curt Tausky, "Occupational Mobility Interests," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4 (November, 1967), pp. 242-249.

[29]Peter M. Blau, Otis Dudley Duncan, The American Occupational Structure, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967).

[30]J. W. Atkinson, (ed.), Motives in Fantasy, Action, and Society, (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1958).

[31]H. Peak, "The Effect of Aroused Motivation on Attitudes," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61 (1960), pp. 463-468.

[32]Victor H. Vroom, Work and Motivation, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964).

[33]J. G. Hunt and J. W. Hill, "The New Look in Motivation Theory and Organizational Research," Human Organization, 28, (Summer 1969), pp. 100-109.

Table 1

Comparative Examples of the Commitment to Work in the United States

Item	Response Alternatives	Samples	
		[1]National Sample of 393 Employed Men	[2]National Sample 274 Male Blue-Collar Workers
1. If by some chance you had enough money to live comfortably without working, do you think you would work anyway?	I would work anyway	80%	81%
	I would not work	20%	19%
2. If you were out of work, which would you rather do?	Go on welfare	--	9%
	Take a job as a car washer that paid the same as welfare	--	91%

[1]Nancy C. Morse, Robert S. Weiss, "The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job," American Sociological Review, 20 (April, 1955), p. 192.

[2]Curt Tausky, "Meanings of Work Among Blue-Collar Men," Pacific Sociological Review, 12 (Spring, 1969), p. 51.

Table 1 (Cont'd)

Comparative Examples of the Commitment to Work in the United States

Item	Response Alternatives	Samples: [3]151 Middle-Managers in 3 Business Firms	[4]1379 Male Vocational-Technical Students	[5]275 Hard-Core Unemployed
1. If by some chance you had enough money to live comfortably without working, do you think you would work anyway?	I would work anyway	89%	87%	80%
	I would not work	11%	13%	20%
2. If you were out of work, which would you rather do?	Go on welfare	9%	16%	29%
	Take a job as a car washer that paid the same as welfare	91%	84%	71%

[3]Ted Jakubowski, "The Meaning of Work Among Middle-Managers," unpublished study, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1968.

[4]Bhopinder S. Bolaria, Curt Tausky, H. Roy Kaplan, unpublished study of vocational-technical training students.

[5]H. Roy Kaplan, "The Meaning of Work Among the Hard-Core Unemployed," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1970.

Table 2

Economic Orientations to Work Among White and Blue Collar Workers and Students*

Items	Response Alternatives	Samples		
		[1]National Sample 274 Male Blue Collar Workers	[2]1379 Vocational-Technical Students	[3]151 Middle Managers in 3 Business Firms
1. Is the most important thing about getting a promotion...	Getting more pay	67%	62%	77%
	Getting more respect from friends and neighbors	33%	33%	21%
2. Which job would you choose if you could be sure of keeping either job?	Better than average pay as a truck driver	73%	77%	67%
	Less than average pay as a bank clerk	27%	22%	32%
3. If you could be sure your income would go up steadily without getting a promotion, would you care about being promoted?	No	74%	60%	29%
	Yes	26%	40%	71%

*All percentages do not add to 100 due to "no answers."

[1]Curt Tausky, "Meanings of Work Among Blue Collar Men," Pacific Sociological Review, 12 (Spring, 1969), p. 51.

[2]Bhopinder S. Bolaria, Curt Tausky, H. Roy Kaplan, unpublished study of vocational-tech. training students.

[3]Ted Jakubowski, "The Meaning of Work Among Middle-Managers," unpublished study, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1968.